

Having considered Plaintiffs’ Motion, and Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion, to  
their proposed Response in Opposition to Defendant Richard Mast’s Response in Support of  
Motion to Stay Discovery and Sur-Reply in Opposition to Defendants Joshua Mast and

Stephanie Mast’s Motion to Stay Discovery (“Sur-Reply”), pursuant to Local Civil Rule 9, and for good cause shown, and the requirements of Local Civil Rule 9(b), and the decisions in *Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc.*, 218 F.3d 288 (4th Cir. 2000), *In re Knight Publishing Co.*, 743 F.2d 231 (4th Cir. 1984), and *Stone v. Univ. of Maryland*, 855 F.2d 178 (4th Cir. 1988) having been met, it is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion is granted. It is further ORDERED that the Sur-Reply and Exhibit 1 thereto are filed under seal.

Entered this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2023.

---

Judge